arXiv:1703.07251v1 [math.CO] 21 Mar 2017

Linear combinations of Rademacher random variables

Harrie Hendriks, Martien C.A. van Zuijlen

Abstract

For a fixed unit vector $a = (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n) \in S^{n-1}$, we consider the 2^n sign vectors $\varepsilon = (\varepsilon^1, \varepsilon^2, \ldots, \varepsilon^n) \in \{+1, -1\}^n$ and the corresponding scalar products $\varepsilon \cdot a = \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon^i a_i$. In this paper we will solve for $n = 1, 2, \ldots, 9$ an old conjecture stating that of the 2^n sums of the form $\sum \pm a_i$ it is impossible that there are more with $|\sum_{i=1}^n \pm a_i| > 1$ than there are with $|\sum_{i=1}^n \pm a_i| \leq 1$. Although the problem has been solved completely in case the a_i's are equal, the more general problem with possible non-equal a_i's remains open for values of $n \geq 10$. The present method can also be used for $n \geq 10$, but unfortunately the technical difficulties seem to grow exponentially with n and no "induction type of argument" has been found. The conjecture has an appealing reformulation in probability theory and in geometry. In probability theory the results lead to upper bounds which are much better than for instance Chebyshev-inequalities.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2000): 60C05, 05A20

Keywords: Linear combinations, Rademacher variables, sign vectors, quadratic programming, linear programming

1 Introduction and result

For a given n we consider the set $\mathcal{S} = \{+1, -1\}^n$ of row vectors $\varepsilon = (\varepsilon^1, \ldots, \varepsilon^n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\varepsilon^i \in \{+1, -1\}, i = 1, \ldots, n$. Given a column vector $a = (a_1, \ldots, a_n)'$ one may consider the product $\varepsilon a = \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon^i a_i \in \mathbb{R}$. The Euclidean length of a will be denoted by $\|a\|$. The problem we address is explicitly mentioned in [5] and acknowledged to Bogusław Tomaszewki: Of the 2^n expressions $|\varepsilon a| = |\varepsilon^1 a_1 + \cdots + \varepsilon^n a_n|$, $\varepsilon \in \mathcal{S}$,

Can there be more with value $> \|a\|$ than with value $\leq \|a\|$?

The result proved in this paper, is the solution for $n \leq 9$:

Theorem 1.1 *Let $n \leq 9$ and $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then $\{\varepsilon \in \mathcal{S} \mid |\varepsilon a| \leq \|a\|\}$ contains at least half of the elements of $\mathcal{S}$.*

Let for the moment $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \ldots, \epsilon_n$ be independent Rademacher random variables and let

$$S_n := a_1\epsilon_1 + a_2\epsilon_2 + \cdots + a_n\epsilon_n,$$

where $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n$ are any real numbers such that $a_1^2 + a_2^2 + \cdots + a_n^2 = 1$. In [11], Pinelis showed that

$$\mathbb{P}\{S_n \geq x\} \leq c\,\mathbb{P}\{Z \geq x\}$$

where Z is the standard normal r.v. and c is an almost optimal constant. He indicated that, while S_n represents a simplest case of the sum of independent non-identically distributed r.v.'s, it is still very difficult to control in a precise manner. As a by-product he obtained

$$\mathbb{P}\{S_n \geq x\} \leq h_1(x),$$

where

$$h_1(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{for } x \leq 0, \\ \frac{1}{2}, & \text{for } 0 < x \leq 1, \\ \frac{1}{2x^2}, & \text{for } 1 \leq x < \sqrt{2}, \\ g(x), & \text{for } \sqrt{2} \leq x < \sqrt{3}, \\ h(x), & \text{for } x \geq \sqrt{3}, \end{cases}$$

and where g and h are complicated expressions involving the standard normal density and the standard normal distribution function, but g and h are independent of n and of the a_i's. In [10], Pinelis proved that for $x > 0$

$$\mathbb{P}\{S_n \geq x\} \leq \mathbb{P}\{Z > x\} + \frac{C\phi(x)}{9 + x^2} < \mathbb{P}\{Z > x\}(1 + \frac{C}{x}),$$

where $C := 5\sqrt{2\pi \mathrm{e}}\,\mathbb{P}\{|Z| < 1\} = 14.10\ldots$, and where ϕ is the standard normal density function. Holzman and Kleitman showed in [8] that

$$\mathbb{P}\{|S_n| < 1\} \geq \frac{3}{8}, \text{ if } |a_i| < 1, \text{ for } i = 1, \ldots, n,$$

so that also

$$\mathbb{P}\{|S_n| \leq 1\} \geq \frac{3}{8},$$

but the conjecture that

$$\mathbb{P}\{|S_n| \leq 1\} \geq \frac{1}{2}$$

remained open. In [13], however, Van Zuijlen proved this conjecture in case of equal a_i's. Bentkus and Dzindzalieta obtained in [1] in case $a_1^2 + a_2^2 + \cdots + a_n^2 \leq 1$ the inequality

$$\mathbb{P}\{S_n \geq x\} \leq c\mathbb{P}\{Z \geq x\}, \text{ for all } x \in \mathbb{R},$$

where $c = (4\mathbb{P}\{Z \geq \sqrt{2}\})^{-1} = 3.178\ldots$ is optimal. Bentkus and Dzindzalieta obtained in [1] the inequality

$$\mathbb{P}\{S_n \geq x\} \leq \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{8}(1 - \sqrt{2 - 2/x^2}), \text{ for } x \in (1, \sqrt{2}].$$

It has also been indicated in [3, p. 31] how to use Lyapunov type bounds, with explicit constants for the remainder term in the Central Limit Theorem, in order to obtain upper bounds for $\mathbb{P}\{S_n \geq x\}$. Let $Y_1, Y_2, \ldots, Y_n$ be independent rv's such that $\mathbf{E}Y_j = 0$ for all j. Denote $\beta_j = \mathbf{E}|Y_j|^3$. Assume that the sum $U_n = Y_1 + Y_2 + \cdots + Y_n$ has unit variance. Then there exits an absolute constant, say c_L, such that

$$|\mathbb{P}\{U_n \geq x\} - (1 - \Phi(x)| \leq c_L(\beta_1 + \beta_2 + .. + \beta_n).$$

It is known that $c_L \leq 0.56$. By replacing Y_j by $a_j\epsilon_j$ and using $\beta_j = |a_j|^3 \leq \tau a_j^2$ with $\tau = \max\{|a_j|, j = 1, \ldots, n\}$ we obtain

$$|\mathbb{P}\{S_n \geq x\} - (1 - \Phi(x)| \leq c_L\tau.$$

Dzindzalieta, Juškevičius and Šileikis proved in [4] that, for $M_n = X_1 + X_2 + \cdots + X_n$ a sum of independent symmetric rv's such that $|X_i| \leq 1$,

$$\mathbb{P}\{M_n \in A\} \leq \mathbb{P}\{cW_k \in A\},$$

where A is either an interval of the form $[x, \infty)$ or just a single point and $W_k = \epsilon_1 + \cdots + \epsilon_k$. The optimal values c and k are given explicitly. It improves Kwapień's inequality in the case of Rademacher series.
Oleszkiewicz proved in [9] for $n > 1$ and any real numbers $a_1 \geq a_2 \geq \cdots \geq a_n > 0$, that

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{S_n > \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i^2}\right\} > \frac{1}{20},$$

and for $n = 6$ even that, for any $a_1, \ldots, a_6$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{S_6 \geq \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{6} a_i^2}\right\} \geq \frac{7}{64}.$$

In [6] Hendriks and Van Zuijlen studied, in the case $a_1 = a_2 = \ldots = a_n = n^{-1/2}$, the probabilities $\mathbb{P}\{|S_n| \leq \xi\}$ for $\xi \in (0, 1]$, depending on n. Furthermore, we have to mention the interesting papers [7] and [12] of Von Heymann and of Zhubr, where the problem has been studied from a geometrical point of view.
In Section 2 we explain how the proof is devised. In Section 3 we exhibit the ingredients of the proof based on Table 1. At the end of this section we present a slight variation on the result of Holzman and Kleitman in [8]. In the Appendix we collect some ideas about the structure of the problem, and we give some background on quadratic programming.

2 Methods

For vectors $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^m$ we will denote by $x \succcurlyeq y$ the property that $x - y \in \mathbb{R}^m_+$, where $\mathbb{R}_+ = [0, \infty)$. For $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}$ we will denote by $x \succcurlyeq y$ the property that $x \succcurlyeq \underline{1}\, y$ where $\underline{1} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ denotes the vector with all coefficients equal to 1.
In considering the number of elements of $\{\varepsilon \in \mathcal{S} \mid |\varepsilon a| \leq \|a\|\}$ it is clear that without loss of generality we may assume that $a \in \mathcal{Q} := \{x = (x_1, \ldots, x_n)' \mid x_1 \geq x_2 \geq \cdots \geq x_n \geq 0\}$. Let $\mathcal{S}^+$ be the subset of $\mathcal{S}$ of sign vectors $\varepsilon = (\varepsilon^1, \ldots, \varepsilon^n)$ with $\varepsilon^1 = +1$. It is clear that $\{\varepsilon \in \mathcal{S}^+ \mid |\varepsilon a| \leq \|a\|\}$ (resp. $\mathcal{S}^+$) contains half of the elements of $\{\varepsilon \in \mathcal{S} \mid |\varepsilon a| \leq \|a\|\}$ (resp. $\mathcal{S}$) so it is sufficient to prove that for all $a \in \mathcal{Q}$ at least half of the elements $\varepsilon \in \mathcal{S}^+$ satisfy $|\varepsilon a| \leq \|a\|$.
We introduce the *dual* $\mathcal{Q}^*$ of $\mathcal{Q}$ to be defined as the set of row vectors V such that $Va \geq 0$ for all $a \in \mathcal{Q}$. Since $\mathcal{Q}$ is the set of linear combinations with non-negative coefficients

of the n elements (counting the number of ones) of the form $(1,\dots,1,0,\dots,0)$, for V to belong to $\mathcal{Q}^*$ it is necessary and sufficient that the vector of cumulative sums of V, $\overline{V} := (V^1, V^1+V^2, \dots, V^1+V^2+\cdots+V^n)$, satisfies $\overline{V} \succcurlyeq 0$.
Basically the proof of Theorem 1.1 is a compilation of cases where we use the following argument:

Lemma 2.1 *Let $e_1,\dots,e_k \in \mathcal{S}$ for some $k \geq 1$ and $\sigma^1,\dots,\sigma^k \in \{+1,-1\}$. Suppose there exist row vectors $R \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\lambda = (\lambda^1,\dots,\lambda^k) \succcurlyeq 0$ with $\|R\| \leq 1$ and $\lambda^1+\cdots+\lambda^k = 1$, such that $R - L \in Q^*$ (i.e. $La \leq Ra$ for all $a \in \mathcal{Q}$), where $L = \sum \lambda^\ell \sigma^\ell e_\ell$. Then for all $a \in \mathcal{Q}$ we have the implications*

$$\left[\forall \ell : \sigma^\ell e_\ell a \geq 0\right] \Rightarrow \left[\min_\ell |e_\ell a| \leq La \leq Ra \leq \|R\|\,\|a\| \leq \|a\|\right] \Rightarrow \left[\exists \ell : |e_\ell a| \leq \|a\|\right]. \blacksquare$$

Given the signs $\sigma^1,\dots,\sigma^k$, there are many combinations $e_1,\dots,e_k \in \mathcal{S}$ that share the same vectors λ and R, although, generally, the vector L depends on the particular combination. Suppose R and λ as in Lemma 2.1 are found, so that in particular $\|R\| \leq 1$. Then, without changing its norm, by taking absolute values and sorting the coefficients of vector R, one can arrange that $R' \in \mathcal{Q}$ and still satisfies the conditions of Lemma 2.1. In the Appendix it is shown, that R and λ can be found as in Lemma 2.1, such that R itself satisfies $R' \in \mathcal{Q}$ and $\sigma^\ell e_\ell R' \geq 0,\ \ell = 1,\dots,k$, but such restriction on R would lead to unnecessary complications in our arguments.
We enumerate the elements of $\mathcal{S}$ as follows:

$$\varepsilon = (\varepsilon^1,\dots,\varepsilon^n) = \varepsilon_i \text{ with } i = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \frac{1-\varepsilon^{n-j}}{2} 2^j.$$

Then $\mathcal{S}^+$ is the subset of $\mathcal{S}$ of the ε_i with $0 \leq i < 2^{n-1}$. Often we will identify $\mathcal{S}^+$ with the numerals $\{i \mid 0 \leq i < 2^{n-1}\}$. In general we will call an ordered set $(i_1,\dots,i_k) \in (\mathcal{S}^+)^k$ a *k-tuple* (or *pair*, for $k=2$) and call it a *k-tuplet* (or *twin*, for $k=2$), if for any $a \in \mathcal{Q}$ $\#\{\ell \mid |\varepsilon_{i_\ell}| \leq \|a\|\} \geq k/2$. A pair $(i,j) \in \mathcal{S}^+ \times \mathcal{S}^+$ will be called *conjugate* if $i+j = 2^{n-1}-1$ or, equivalently $\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_i + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_j = (1,0,\dots,0)$. We will refer to i and j as the legs of the pair.
Proof of Theorem 1.1 It is rather obvious to see, that we need only consider the case $n = 9$. The proof follows the scheme given in Table 1. The table gives a partition of the sign vectors in $\mathcal{S}^+$ in unions of conjugate pairs enclosed in outer parentheses, and the conjugate twins that are not mentioned in the table. In the next section we will prove that the thus given $2k$-tuples form $2k$-tuplets. $\blacksquare$

3 Proofs

We base the proof of Theorem 1.1 on the proof scheme in Table 1. Recall that in proving Theorem 1.1 it is enough to show that for all $a \in \mathcal{Q}$, for at least half of the sign-vectors $\varepsilon \in \mathcal{S}^+$ it holds that $|\varepsilon a| \leq \|a\|$.

Conjugate twins

A pair (i,j) or $(\varepsilon_i, \varepsilon_j) \in \mathcal{S}^+ \times \mathcal{S}^+$ with $i \neq j$ is a *twin* if for all $a \in \mathcal{Q}$ it holds that $\min(|\varepsilon_i a|, |\varepsilon_j a|) \leq \|a\|$. Of course, if we could partition $\mathcal{S}^+$ into disjoint twins, we would

(0 255 (94 161) (105 150) (109 146))	(32 223 (102 153))
(1 254 (95 160) (104 151) (108 147))	(33 222 (103 152))
(2 253 (93 162) (106 149))	(34 221 (101 154))
(3 252 (92 163) (107 148))	(35 220 (100 155))
(4 251 (91 164) (99 156))	
(5 250 (90 165))	(64 191 (54 201))
(6 249 (89 166))	(65 190 (55 200))
(7 248 (88 167))	(66 189 (53 202))
(8 247 (87 168) (113 142))	(67 188 (52 203))
(9 246 (86 169))	
(10 245 (85 170))	(128 127 (58 197))
(11 244 (84 171))	(129 126 (59 196))
(12 243 (83 172))	(130 125 (57 198))
(13 242 (82 173))	(131 124 (56 199))
(14 241 (81 174))	
(15 240 (80 175))	
(16 239 (79 176) (114 141))	
(17 238 (78 177))	
(18 237 (77 178))	
(19 236 (76 179))	
(20 235 (75 180))	
(24 231 (71 184))	

Table 1: Proof scheme for $n = 9$, numbers should not appear twice. Terms enclosed in matching parentheses correspond to twins, 4-tuples, 6-tuples, 8-tuples. Non mentioned numbers belong to conjugate twins.

have proved Theorem 1.1. Unfortunately, such partitioning is not possible.
Let $R_1 = (1, 0, \ldots, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $R_0 = (0, \ldots, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Conjugate pairs (i, j) are rather special in the following sense: if $a \in \mathcal{Q}$, then $\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_i a + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_j a = R_1 a = a_1 \geq 0$.

Remark 3.1 *Let $(\varepsilon_i, \varepsilon_j)$ be a conjugate pair and $a \in \mathcal{Q}$. Then*

$$R_1 - \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_i - \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_j = 0 \in \mathcal{Q}^* \text{ and } R_0 + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_i + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_j = R_1 \in \mathcal{Q}^*.$$

Then

- *If $\min(\varepsilon_i a, \varepsilon_j a) \geq 0$, then $\min(|\varepsilon_i a|, |\varepsilon_j a|) \leq |R_1 a| \leq \|a\|$ (Lemma 2.1, with $k = 2$ and $\sigma^1 = \sigma^2 = 1$)*
- *If both $\varepsilon_i a \leq 0$ and $\varepsilon_j a \leq 0$ then $\min(|\varepsilon_i a|, |\varepsilon_j a|) \leq R_0 a = 0 \leq \|a\|$ (Lemma 2.1, with $k = 2$ and $\sigma^1 = \sigma^2 = -1$). In fact, then $a_1 = R_1 a \leq 0$ so that $a = 0$.*

Notice that $|\min(\varepsilon_i a, \varepsilon_j a)| = \min(|\varepsilon_i a|, |\varepsilon_j a|)$.
Thus $(\varepsilon_i, \varepsilon_j)$ is a twin if and only if $[\min(\varepsilon_i a, \varepsilon_j a) < 0] \Rightarrow [\,|\min(\varepsilon_i a, \varepsilon_j a)| \leq \|a\|]$. ■

From now on we assume $n = 9$. Let $R_2 = \frac{1}{2}(1,1,1,1,0,\ldots,0) \in \mathbb{R}^9$ and $R_3 = \frac{1}{3}(1,\ldots,1) \in \mathbb{R}^9$.

Theorem 3.2 *Let $n = 9$. Of all the 128 conjugate pairs $(\varepsilon_i, \varepsilon_j) \in \mathcal{S}^+ \times \mathcal{S}^+$ with $i < j$, exactly 34 of them are non-twin, namely the pairs*

$$(i,j) = (255-j, j), \text{ with } j = 128,\ldots,131,188,\ldots,191,220,\ldots,223,231,235,\ldots,255.$$

Proof Given ε_ℓ, we show that there exists a vector R such that $R+\varepsilon_\ell \in \mathcal{Q}^*$ and $\|R\| \leq 1$ so that Lemma 2.1 ($k = 1$, $\sigma^1 = -1$) applies, or there is a vector R such that $R' \in \mathcal{Q}$, $\|R\| > 1$ and $-\varepsilon_\ell R' \geq RR'$. These vectors R are found as feasible solution if not the optimal solution of a quadratic programming problem as explained in Theorem 4.2 and Remarks 4.4 and 4.5.

- The sign vectors ε_ℓ with $0 \leq \ell \leq 123$, $128 \leq \ell \leq 187$ or $192 \leq \ell \leq 219$ satisfy $R_3 + \varepsilon_\ell \in \mathcal{Q}^*$. In particular $0 \leq -\varepsilon_\ell a \leq R_3 a \leq \|R_3\|\|a\| = \|a\|$ for all a satisfying $0 \leq -\varepsilon_\ell a$. Notice that the given sign vectors ε_ℓ are exactly those satisfying $\varepsilon_\ell - \varepsilon_{219} \in \mathcal{Q}^*$.

- For $R = \frac{3}{7}(1,1,1,1,1,1,1,0,0)$ and $124 \leq \ell \leq 127$, $188 \leq \ell \leq 191$ and $220 \leq \ell \leq 223$ we have $\|R\|^2 = RR' = \frac{9}{7}$ and $\varepsilon_\ell R' = -\frac{9}{7} < 0$, so that $|\varepsilon_\ell R'| > \|R\|$.

- For $224 \leq \ell \leq 230$ and $232 \leq \ell \leq 234$ we have $R_2 + \varepsilon_\ell \in \mathcal{Q}^*$. Notice that the sign vectors ε_ℓ with $R_2 + \varepsilon_\ell \in \mathcal{Q}^*$ are exactly those satisfying $\varepsilon_\ell - \varepsilon_{234} \in \mathcal{Q}^*$.

- For $\ell = 231$ and $\ell = 235$ and $R = \frac{1}{10}(5,5,5,5,2,2,2,2,2)$ we have $RR' = \frac{6}{5}$ and $\varepsilon_\ell R' = -\frac{6}{5} < 0$, so that $|\varepsilon_\ell R'| > \|R\|$.

- For $236 \leq \ell \leq 239$ and $R = \frac{3}{7}(1,1,1,1,1,1,1,0,0)$ we have $RR' = \frac{9}{7}$ and $\varepsilon_\ell R' = -\frac{9}{7} < 0$, so that $|\varepsilon_\ell R'| > \|R\|$.

- For $240 \leq \ell \leq 255$ and $R = \frac{3}{5}(1,1,1,1,1,0,0,0,0)$ we have $RR' = \frac{9}{5}$ and $\varepsilon_\ell R' = -\frac{9}{5} < 0$, so that $|\varepsilon_\ell R'| > \|R\|$.

The non-twins are those conjugate pairs $(\varepsilon_i, \varepsilon_j)$ where $[\varepsilon_\ell a < 0] \Rightarrow [\,|\varepsilon_\ell a| \leq \|a\|]$ fails for $\ell = i$ or for $\ell = j$. ■

Remark 3.3 *Notice two curious facts*

- *$\varepsilon_j \in \mathcal{Q}^*$ for $j = 128,\ldots,131$ and*
  $\varepsilon_{255-j} \in \mathcal{Q}^*$ for $j = 188\ldots,191,220,\ldots,223,231,235,\ldots,255$.
  In particular, for each non-twin conjugate pair, one of the two legs belongs to $\mathcal{Q}^*$.

- *Among the 94 conjugate twins there are 40 special twins in the sense that one of the legs ε in these twins satisfy $|\varepsilon a| \leq \|a\|$ for all $a \in Q$. These are the ε_j, with $j = 170,\ldots,175,178,\ldots,187,202,\ldots,207,210,\ldots,219,226,\ldots,230,232,233,234$.*

For these ε_j we have $R_1 - \varepsilon_j \in \mathcal{Q}^*$ and [$R_2 + \varepsilon_j \in \mathcal{Q}^*$ or $R_3 + \varepsilon_j \in \mathcal{Q}^*$]. ■

Proof witnesses

We will be able to combine any conjugate pair (e_1, e_2) with $k-1$ ($k = 1, 2, 3, 4$) conjugate twins (e_{2l-1}, e_{2l}), $l = 2, ..., k$, yielding a $2k$-tuple $A := (e_1, e_2, (e_3, e_4), (e_5, e_6), ..., (e_{2k-1}, e_{2k}))$, with the property that for all a in $\mathcal{Q}$, at least k terms of $(|e_1 a|, |e_2 a|, ..., |e_{2k-1} a|, |e_{2k} a|)$ are not greater than $\|a\|$, proving that the $2k$-tuple is a $2k$-tuplet.
Let $a \in \mathcal{Q}$, $a \neq 0$. Say $\varepsilon \in \mathcal{S}$ is *good* if $|\varepsilon a| \leq \|a\|$. In order to show that A is a $2k$-tuplet, we notice that already each of the $k-1$ twins has a good leg, we therefore leave out from A from each twin (e_{2l-1}, e_{2l}) that sign vector e for which $|ea| = \min(|e_{2l-1} a|, |e_{2l} a|)$. For this e we have $|ea| \leq \|a\|$ and for the remaining sign vector e^* we necessarily have $e^* a \geq 0$. So in the remaining $k+1$-tuple $\tilde{A}$ we need only find one good sign vector.
For the conjugate pair (e_1, e_2) we recall that if $e_1 a \geq 0$ and $e_2 a \geq 0$ then at least one of $e_1 a, e_2 a$ is not greater than $\|a\|$ and we have found a good sign vector. If not, say $e_1 a < 0$, then we have $0 < -e_1 a \leq e_2 a$, and if $\min(|e_1 a|, |e_2 a|) \leq ||a||$, then $0 < -e_1 a \leq \|a\|$ and we can also leave out e_2 from $\tilde{A}$, so that in the remaining k-tuple A^* we still have to find a good sign vector.
Summarizing it is sufficient to prove that for all combinations of k positions $s_1, \ldots, s_k$ with $s_1 \in \{1, 2\}, \ldots, s_k \in \{2k-1, 2k\}$ and signs $\sigma^1 = -1, \sigma^2 = +1, \ldots, \sigma^k = +1$, condition $\forall i : \sigma^i e_{s_i} a \geq 0$ implies that there is some i with $|e_{s_i} a| \leq \|a\|$.
For any such combination, by Lemma 2.1, it is sufficient to produce a row-vector $R \in \mathbb{R}^9$ and a vector $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^k$, such that $\|R\| \leq 1$, $\lambda \succcurlyeq 0$, $\lambda^1 + \cdots + \lambda^k = 1$ and $R - \sum \lambda^i \sigma^i e_{s_i} \in \mathcal{Q}^*$.
We will use the following notation

$(2k)$-tuplet	case	R	λ
$(e_1, e_2, (e_3, e_4), \ldots, (e_{2k-1}, e_{2k}))$	$[s_1, \ldots, s_k]$	$R = (R^1, \ldots, R^9)$	$(\lambda^1, \ldots, \lambda^k)$

to claim that $R - L \in \mathcal{Q}^*$ where $L = \sum \lambda^i \sigma^i \varepsilon_{s_i}$ with $\sigma^1 = -1$, $\sigma^2 = \ldots = \sigma^k = +1$. Clearly if some $\lambda^\ell = 0$, the sign vector e_{s_ℓ} is irrelevant, which we will denote by putting a '$*$' instead of s_ℓ.

2-tuplets (conjugate twins revisited)

In the notation proposed above, we can give witnesses of the proof for conjugate twins (i.e. $k = 1$) as follows. Recall the understood sign is $\sigma^1 = -1$.

twin	case	R	λ
(21,234)	[1]	$R_3 = (1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1)/3$	1
	[2]	$R_2 = (1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)/2$	1

These values hold for all twins $(i, 255-i)$ with $i = 21, 22, 23, 25, \ldots, 31, 37, \ldots, 39, 41, \ldots, 47, 49, \ldots, 63, 69, \ldots, 71, 73, \ldots, 79, 81, \ldots, 95, 97, \ldots, 123$. It also works for the remaining twins with $i = 255 - j$ with $j = 36, 40, 48, 68, 72, 80, 96$.

Recall the meaning of the above table, for example for $i = 31$, is as follows

$$\begin{aligned} R_3 - \lambda\sigma^1\varepsilon_{31} &= (1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1)/3 + (1,1,1,1,-1,-1,-1,-1,-1) \\ &= (4,4,4,4,-2,-2,-2,-2,-2)/3 \in \mathcal{Q}^* \\ R_2 - \lambda\sigma^1\varepsilon_{224} &= (1,1,1,1,0,0,0,0,0)/2 + (1,-1,-1,-1,1,1,1,1,1) \\ &= (3,-1,-1,-1,2,2,2,2,2)/2 \in \mathcal{Q}^* \end{aligned}$$

Remark 3.4 *Fortunately a proof can be constructed around the idea to combine any conjugate pair with conjugate twins in order to find subsets of $\mathcal{S}^+$ that form $(2k)$-tuplets. For (very) high n this is certainly not possible any more, since the fraction of conjugate twins among conjugate pairs asymptotically converges to 0. For $n = 9$, there happen to be 8-tuples comprising 4 conjugate pairs of which only one is conjugate twin. Examples are (7, 248, 20, 235, 33, 222, (77, 178)) and (15, 240, 24, 231, 66, 189, (87, 168)).*

4-tuplets

We will first prove that the 15 combinations $(i, 255 - i, (95 - i, 160 + i))$ with $i = 5, 6, 7, 9, \ldots, 15, 17, \ldots, 20, 24$ are 4-tuplets.

4-tuplet	case	R	λ
(5,250,(90,165))	[1, *]	$(0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0)$	$(1,0)$
	[2, 3]	$R_2 = (1,1,1,1,0,0,0,0,0)/2$	$(1,1)/2$
	[2, 4]	$R_3^* = (2,1,1,1,1,1,0,0,0)/3$	$(1,5)/6$

These values hold for all 15 4-tuples $(255-j, j, j-160, 255-j+160)$ with $j = 231, 235, \ldots, 238, 240, \ldots, 246, 248, \ldots, 250$. More precisely, for those j: $L = \frac{1}{2}(-\varepsilon_j) + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_{j-160} = \frac{1}{2}(-\varepsilon_{250}) + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_{90} = (0,1,0,1,0,0,0,0,0)$. We then have

$$\begin{aligned} R_2 - L &= (1,1,1,1,0,0,0,0,0)/2 - (0,1,0,1,0,0,0,0,0) \\ &= (1,-1,1,-1,0,0,0,0,0)/2 \in \mathcal{Q}^* \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, for those j, with $L_5 = \frac{1}{6}(-\varepsilon_{250}) + \frac{5}{6}\varepsilon_{165}$ we have: $L_5 - (\frac{1}{6}(-\varepsilon_j) + \frac{5}{6}\varepsilon_{255-j+160}) \in \mathcal{Q}^*$ and

$$\begin{aligned} R_3^* - L_5 &= (2,1,1,1,1,1,0,0,0)/3 - (2,-2,3,-2,3,3,-3,-3,3)/3 \\ &= (0,3,-2,3,-2,-2,3,-3,3)/3 \in \mathcal{Q}^*. \end{aligned}$$

There are 12 more 4-tuplets.

4-tuplet	case	R	λ
(32,223,(102,153))	[2, *]	$(0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0)$	$(1,0)$
	[2, 3]	$R_5 = (3,3,1,1,1,1,1,1,1)/5$	$(2,3)/5$
	[2, 4]	$R_3 = (1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1)/3$	$(1,2)/3$

These values also hold for (33,222,(103,152)), (34,221,(101,154)), (35,220,(100,155)), (64,191,(54,201)); (65,190,(55,200)); (66,189,(53,202)); (67,188,(52,203)); (128,127,(58,197)); (129,126,(59,196)); (130,125,(57,198)); (131,124,(56,199)).

6-tuplets

We need consider the following five cases
(2,253,(93,162),(106,149)); (3,252,(92,163),(107,148)); (4,251,(91,164),(99,156));
(8,247,(87,168),(113,142)); (16,239,(79,176),(114,141)).

6-tuplet	case	R	λ
(2,253,(93,162),(106,149))	[1, *, *]	$(0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0)$	$(1,0,0)$
	[2, 3, *]	$R_2 = (1,1,1,1,0,0,0,0,0)/2$	$(1,1,0)/2$
	[2, 4, 5]	$R_3^* = (4,2,2,2,2,1,1,1,1)/6$	$(1,2,3)/6$
	[2, 4, 6]	$R_3^* = (2,1,1,1,1,1,0,0,0)/3$	$(1,2,3)/6$

the same values hold for (3,252,(92,163),(107,148)).

6-tuplet	case	R	λ
(4,251,(91,164),(99,156))	[1, *, *]	$(0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0)$	$(1,0,0)$
	[2, 3, *]	$R_2 = (1,1,1,1,0,0,0,0,0)/2$	$(1,1,0)/2$
	[2, 4, 5]	$R_3^* = (2,1,1,1,1,1,0,0,0)/3$	$(1,2,3)/6$
	[2, 4, 6]	$R_6 = (4,2,2,2,2,1,1,1,1)/6$	$(1,3,2)/6$

the same values also hold for (8,247,(87,168),(113,142)) and (16,239,(79,176),(114,141)).

8-tuplets

We need consider the two cases (0,255,(94,161),(105,150),(109,146)) and
(1,254,(95,160),(104,151),(108,147)).

8-tuplet (0,255,(94,161),(105,150),(109,146))

case	R	λ
[1, *, *, *]	$(0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0)$	$(1,0,0,0)$
[2, *, *, 7]	$R_5 = (3,3,1,1,1,1,1,1,1)/5$	$(2,0,0,3)/5$
[2, 3, *, 8]	$R_2 = (1,1,1,1,0,0,0,0,0)/2$	$(1,2,0,1)/4$
[2, *, 5, 8]	$R_4 = (3,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,0)/4$	$(1,0,4,3)/8$
[2, 4, 6, *]	$R_3^* = (2,1,1,1,1,1,0,0,0)/3$	$(1,1,4,0)/6$

Same works for the other 8-tuplet.

Notice that the conjugate pair $(1, 254)$ also fits in a 6-tuplet, e.g. (1,254,(94,161),(86,169)). We were not able to exploit this fact since the involved twins are needed elsewhere.

We have collected in Table 2 the vectors $R \in \mathbb{R}^9$ needed in the proof of Theorem 1.1.

An additional result

In relation to the results in Holzman and Kleitman [8] consider the maximal numbers c_k, $k = 1, \ldots, n$, such that

$$\frac{1}{2^n}\#\{\varepsilon \in \mathcal{S} \mid |\varepsilon a| < \|a\|\} \geq c_k, \text{ if } |a_i| > 0, \text{ for } i \leq k, \text{ and } a_i = 0 \text{ for } i > k.$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
R_0 &= (0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0);\\
R_1 &= (1,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0);\\
R_2 &= (1,1,1,1,0,0,0,0,0)/2;\\
R_3 &= (1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1)/3;\\
R_3^* &= (2,1,1,1,1,1,0,0,0)/3;\\
R_4 &= (3,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,0)/4;\\
R_5 &= (3,3,1,1,1,1,1,1,1)/5;\\
R_6 &= (4,2,2,2,2,1,1,1,1)/6;
\end{aligned}
$$

Table 2: Table of vectors used in the proof

The result in [8] implies that $c_k \geq 3/8$ for $k \geq 2$. Notice that for any $R = (r_1, r_2, 0, \ldots, 0)$ with $r_1 \geq r_2 > 0$, it holds that $|\varepsilon R| \in \{r_1 - r_2, r_1 + r_2\}$. Of course $0 \leq r_1 - r_2 \leq \|R\| = \sqrt{r_1^2 + r_2^2} < r_1 + r_2$, and even $2^{-n}\#\{\varepsilon \in \mathcal{S} \mid |\varepsilon R| < \|R\|\} = 2^{-n}\#\{\varepsilon \in \mathcal{S} \mid \varepsilon^1 = -\varepsilon^2\} = \frac{1}{2}$. This result also holds for vectors a sufficiently close to R, say for a satisfying $\|R - a\| < \delta$ where δ depends on R. Of course there are vectors $a \in \mathcal{Q}$ with $a_i > 0$, for $i = 1, \ldots, n$ and $\|R - a\| < \delta$. Therefore, $c_k \leq 1/2$ for all $2 \leq k \leq n$.

Theorem 3.5 *Let $n = 9$. We have $c_1 = 0$ attained for $a = R_1$, $c_2 = c_3 = 1/2$, $c_4 = 3/8$ attained for $a = R_2$, $c_5 = 1/2$, $c_6 = 15/32$ attained for $a = R_3^*$, $c_7 = 1/2$, $c_8 = 7/16$ attained for $a = R_4$ and $c_9 = 63/128$ attained for $a = R_3$.*

Proof For any $a \in \mathcal{Q}$ we have shown that for at least half of $\varepsilon \in \mathcal{S}^+$ there is R from the above table, R depending on ε, such that $|\varepsilon a| \leq Ra$. Moreover, if $a \in \mathcal{Q}$ is not a scalar multiple of any R from this table, the inequality $Ra \leq \|a\|$ is strict. So we need only consider the vectors a from Table 2. The theorem follows simply by counting the number of sign sequences ε with $|\varepsilon R| < \|R\|$. ■

4 Appendix

Group structure

Notice that there is a product structure given by $\varepsilon_i * \varepsilon_j = \varepsilon_k$ where $\epsilon_k^\ell = \epsilon_i^\ell \epsilon_j^\ell$ which turns $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{S}^+$ into an abelian group. The resulting index k may be denoted by $k = i * j$. Notice that $j = 0 * j = j * 0$ and $j * j = 0$. When $\varepsilon_i * \varepsilon_j = \varepsilon_k$ we will also say that ε_k is the *translate* of ε_i by ε_j. Our presentation is pervaded with *conjugate pairs*, that is pairs (i, j) of integers with $i + j = 2^{n-1} - 1 = i * j$ and $i, j \geq 0$.
In Table 3 considerable effort has been undertaken to go from one row to another by using the above product structure. The horizontal lines indicate a discontinuity in this effort. The resulting proof scheme has the nice property that it reduces to a proof scheme for $n = 8$ by considering only the even numbered rows, starting with 1, 3, ..., and integer division of the numbers in the table by 2. This procedures works iteratively until $n = 5$, ending with the last row of the table, with numbers integer divided by 16. We do not

present a proof based on this scheme, since it is more elaborate then the proof based on Table 1.

(0	255	(93	162)	(105	150)	(63	192))	(69	186)	(41	214)	((120	135)	24	231)
(1	254	(92	163)	(104	151)	(62	193))	(68	187)	(40	215)	(121	134)	(25	230)
(2	253	(95	160)	(106	149)	(61	194))	(71	184)	(43	212)	(122	133)	(26	229)
(3	252	(94	161)	(107	148)	(60	195))	(70	185)	(42	213)	(123	132)	(27	228)
(4	251	(91	164)	(108	147))	((59	196)	65	190)	((45	210)	124	131)	(28	227)
(5	250	(90	165))	(109	146)	((58	197)	64	191)	((44	211)	125	130)	(29	226)
(6	249	(89	166))	(110	145)	((57	198)	67	188)	((47	208)	126	129)	(30	225)
(7	248	(88	167))	(111	144)	((56	199)	66	189)	((46	209)	127	128)	(31	224)
(8	247	(85	170)	(102	153))	((55	200)	(75	180)	32	223)	((116	139)	20	235)
(9	246	(84	171))	(103	152)	((54	201)	(74	181)	33	222)	(117	138)	(21	234)
(10	245	(87	168))	(100	155)	((53	202)	(73	182)$^-$	34	221)	(118	137)	(22	233)
(11	244	(86	169))	(101	154)	((52	203)	(72	183)$^-$	35	220)	(119	136)	(23	232)
(12	243	(81	174))	(98	157)	(51	204)	((79	176)	(36	219)$^-$	(114	141)	16	239)
(13	242	(80	175))	(99	156)	(50	205)	((78	177)	(37	218)$^-$	(115	140)	17	238)
(14	241	(83	172))	(96	159)	(49	206)	(77	178)	(38	217)	((112	143)	18	237)
(15	240	(82	173))	(97	158)	(48	207)	(76	179)	(39	216)	((113	142)	19	236)

Table 3: Proof scheme for $n = 9$, numbers should not appear twice. Terms enclosed in matching parentheses correspond to twins, 4-tuplets, 6-tuplets, 8-tuplets. A twin decorated with a $-$ sign is not needed in the $2k$-tuplet in which it is contained.

Lattice structure

Consider the vectorspace of row vectors $\mathbb{R}^n$. Given $R_1, R_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we will say that R_1 is less than R_2, $R_1 \subseteq R_2$, iff $R_1 a \leq R_2 a$ for all $a \in \mathcal{Q}$. Notice that

$$R_1 \subseteq R_2 \Leftrightarrow \forall a \in \mathcal{Q} : R_1 a \leq R_2 a \Leftrightarrow R_2 - R_1 \in \mathcal{Q}^* \Leftrightarrow \overline{R}_2 - \overline{R}_1 \succcurlyeq 0.$$

Given $R_1, R_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ there is a unique least upper bound $R \in \mathbb{R}^n$, denoted by $R_1 \vee R_2$. Namely, R such that the i-th coordinate of $\overline{R}$ equals $\overline{R}^i = \max(\overline{R}_1^i, \overline{R}_2^i)$. Clearly then, $R_1 \subseteq R$ and $R_2 \subseteq R$. In the same way there is a unique greatest lower bound, denoted by $R_1 \wedge R_2$, namely R such that the i-th coordinate of $\overline{R}$ equals $\overline{R}^i = \min(\overline{R}_1^i, \overline{R}_2^i)$. Clearly then, $R \subseteq R_1$ and $R \subseteq R_2$. Notice also, that $R_1 \wedge R_2 = -((-R_1) \vee (-R_2))$.

Lemma 4.1 *If $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 \in \mathcal{S}$, then $\varepsilon_1 \vee \varepsilon_2 \in \mathcal{S}$ and $\varepsilon_1 \wedge \varepsilon_2 \in \mathcal{S}$. More generally, let A be an arithmetic progression, $A = \{p + q \cdot r \mid r = 1, \ldots, k\}$ for some $p, q \in \mathbb{R}$, and $e_1, e_2 \in A^n$, then $e_1 \vee e_2, e_1 \wedge e_2 \in A^n$.*

Proof $(\varepsilon_1 \vee \varepsilon_2)^1 = \max(\overline{\varepsilon}_1^1, \overline{\varepsilon}_2^1) = \max(\varepsilon_1^1, \varepsilon_2^1)$ and for $i > 1$ we have $(\varepsilon_1 \vee \varepsilon_2)^i = \max(\overline{\varepsilon}_1^i, \overline{\varepsilon}_2^i) - \max(\overline{\varepsilon}_1^{i-1}, \overline{\varepsilon}_2^{i-1})$ is odd integer, at least -1 and at most $+1$. Thus $\varepsilon_1 \vee \varepsilon_2 \in \mathcal{S}$. More generally, let $e_1, e_2 \in A^n$. Without loss of generality in the first place we may suppose that $q \neq 0$ and then we may suppose $p = 0$ and $q = 1$, by considering the transformation

$A \cong \{1,\dots,k\}$ mapping $p+qr$ to r. Notice that if for some $k=1,2$, $\max(\overline{e}_1^i,\overline{e}_2^i)=\overline{e}_k^i$ and $\max(\overline{e}_1^{i-1},\overline{e}_2^{i-1})=\overline{e}_k^{i-1}$ then $\max(\overline{e}_1^i,\overline{e}_2^i)-\max(\overline{e}_1^{i-1},\overline{e}_2^{i-1})=e_k^i\in A$. Else, suppose without loss of generality $\max(\overline{e}_1^i,\overline{e}_2^i)=\overline{e}_1^i$ and $\max(\overline{e}_1^{i-1},\overline{e}_2^{i-1})=\overline{e}_2^{i-1}$. Then $\overline{e}_1^i-\overline{e}_2^{i-1}$ is an integer with

$$e_2^i\le\overline{e}_1^i-\overline{e}_2^i+e_2^i=\overline{e}_1^i-\overline{e}_2^{i-1}=\overline{e}_1^{i-1}-\overline{e}_2^{i-1}+e_1^i\le e_1^i$$

so that $(e_1\vee e_2)^i=\overline{e}_1^i-\overline{e}_2^{i-1}\in\{1,\dots,k\}$. ■

In particular, for $n=9$, the greatest lower bound of $\{\varepsilon_i\in\mathcal{S}^+\mid R_3+\varepsilon_i\in\mathcal{Q}^*\}$ is ε_{219}. The greatest lower bound of $\{\varepsilon_i\in\mathcal{S}^+\mid R_2+\varepsilon_i\in\mathcal{Q}^*\}$ is ε_{234}. The greatest lower bound of $\{\varepsilon_i\in\mathcal{S}^+\mid R_3+\varepsilon_i\in\mathcal{Q}^*$ and $R_2+\varepsilon_i\in\mathcal{Q}^*\}$ is the least upper bound of $\{\varepsilon_{219},\varepsilon_{234}\}$, and that is ε_{218}. The least upper bound of $\{\varepsilon_i\mid 123<i<128$, or $187<i<192$, or $219<i<224$, or $236\le i\le 239\}$ is ε_{124}. The least upper bound of $\{\varepsilon_i\mid i=231$ or $i=235\}$ is ε_{231}. The least upper bound of $\{\varepsilon_i\mid 240\le i\le 255\}$ is ε_{240}. The greatest lower bound of $\{\varepsilon_i\in\mathcal{S}^+\mid\varepsilon_i\in\mathcal{Q}^*\}$ is ε_{170}.

Programming

In this subsection we expound the context in which we developed the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Be given $e_1,\dots,e_k\in\mathcal{S}$. We consider the problem of finding $(R,\lambda)\in\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R}_+^k$ such that $\frac{1}{2}RR'$ is minimal, subject to $\lambda^1+\cdots+\lambda^k=1$ and $R-L\in\mathcal{Q}^*$, where $L=\sum\lambda^i e_i$. Let Q be the $n\times n$-matrix with diagonal -1 and superdiagonal $+1$, so that $x\in\mathcal{Q}$ is equivalent to $Qx\preccurlyeq 0$. Then $R-L\in\mathcal{Q}^*$ is equivalent to $(R-L)Q^{-1}\preccurlyeq 0$. Let E be the $k\times n$-matrix with rows $e_1,\dots,e_k$ and $\underline{1}$ the $k\times 1$ matrix with coefficients 1. Then $L=\lambda E$ and the conditions are:

$$\begin{aligned}(R-\lambda E)Q^{-1}&\preccurlyeq 0\\ -\lambda&\preccurlyeq 0\\ \lambda\,\underline{1}&=1.\end{aligned}$$

In matrix form, where the big matrix is of dimension $(n+k)\times(n+k)$, one obtains

$$(R,\lambda)\begin{pmatrix}Q^{-1}&0\\ -EQ^{-1}&-I\end{pmatrix}\preccurlyeq(0,0)\text{ and }\lambda\,\underline{1}=1,$$

where I denotes the $k\times k$ identity matrix. The dual program involves parameters $(u,v)\in\mathbb{R}_+^n\times\mathbb{R}_+^k$ and $w\in\mathbb{R}$. The Lagrange dual goal function is

$$\begin{aligned}g(u,v,w)&=\min\{\frac{1}{2}aa'+\left[(a,\ell)\begin{pmatrix}Q^{-1}&0&0\\ -EQ^{-1}&-I&\underline{1}\end{pmatrix}-(0,0,1)\right]\begin{pmatrix}u\\ v\\ w\end{pmatrix}\mid(a,\ell)\in\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R}^k\}\\ &=\min\{-\frac{1}{2}aa'-w\mid(a,\ell)\text{ s.t. }\begin{pmatrix}a'\\ 0\end{pmatrix}+\begin{pmatrix}Q^{-1}&0&0\\ -EQ^{-1}&-I&\underline{1}\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}u\\ v\\ w\end{pmatrix}=0\}\\ &=\begin{cases}-\frac{1}{2}(Q^{-1}u)'(Q^{-1}u)-w,\text{ if }-EQ^{-1}u-v+\underline{1}\,w=0;\\ -\infty,\text{ else.}\end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

For the optimal solution the parameters (R,λ) and (u,v,w) have to satisfy additionally the complementary slackness conditions $(R-\lambda E)Q^{-1}u=0$, $\lambda v=0$, and the crucial

$$0=\begin{pmatrix}R'\\0\end{pmatrix}+\begin{pmatrix}Q^{-1}&0&0\\-EQ^{-1}&-I&\underline{1}\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}u\\v\\w\end{pmatrix}=\begin{pmatrix}R'+Q^{-1}u\\-EQ^{-1}u-v+\underline{1}\,w\end{pmatrix}\in\mathbb{R}^{n+k}$$

to have $\max\{g(u,v,w)\mid (u,v)\succcurlyeq 0,w\}=\min\{\frac{1}{2}RR'\mid (R,\lambda)$ such that $\lambda\succcurlyeq 0,\lambda\underline{1}=1$, and $R-\lambda E\in\mathcal{Q}^*\}$. In particular $QR'=-u\preccurlyeq 0$, so $R'\in\mathcal{Q}$. Moreover $RR'=-RQ^{-1}u=-\lambda EQ^{-1}u=\lambda v-\lambda\underline{1}\,w=-w$, and $v=ER'-\underline{1}\,RR'\succcurlyeq 0$.
We finish with the following summary:

Theorem 4.2 *Be given $e_1,\ldots,e_k\in\mathcal{S}$. Consider the quadratic program of finding the minimum $(R,\lambda)\in\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R}^k$ of $\frac{1}{2}RR'$, subject to $0\preccurlyeq\lambda$, $\lambda^1+\cdots+\lambda^k=1$ and $R-L\in\mathcal{Q}^*$, where $L=\sum\lambda^i e_i$. Then a feasible solution (R,λ) is optimal if and only if $R'\in\mathcal{Q}$, and $e_iR'\geq RR'$ for $i=1,\ldots,k$.*

Proof By inspection of the dual program. Notice that the theorem implies the complementary slackness conditions above, that evaluate to $LR'=RR'$. ■

Remark 4.3 *Suppose R and λ are as in Theorem 4.2, and $(S,\mu)\in\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R}^k_+$ is such that $\mu^1+\cdots+\mu^k=1$ and that, with $M=\sum\mu^i e_i$ we have $S-M\in\mathcal{Q}^*$. Then $SS'-RR'=(S-R)(S-R)'+2(S-R)R'\geq(S-R)(S-R)'+2(M-R)R'=(S-R)(S-R)'$. In particular there is exactly one R for which there exists λ as in Theorem 4.2.* ■

Remark 4.4 *Be given $e_1,\ldots,e_k\in\mathcal{S}$. Suppose $(R,\lambda)\in\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R}^k_+$, is such that $\lambda^1+\cdots+\lambda^k=1$ and $R-L\in\mathcal{Q}^*$, where $L=\sum\lambda^i e_i$, and suppose $RR'\leq 1$. Then the following holds: If $a\in\mathcal{Q}$ is such that $e_ia\geq 0$, $i=1,\ldots,k$, then $0\leq\min_i e_ia\leq La\leq Ra\leq\|R\|\|a\|\leq\|a\|$.* ■

The last remark coincides with Lemma 2.1. Notice that given R the search for a convex combination L of $e_1,\ldots,e_k$ such that $R-L\in\mathcal{Q}^*$ corresponds to a linear optimization problem, finding maximal $x\in\mathbb{R}$ for which $\overline{R}-\overline{L}\succcurlyeq x$ which is successful if one finds $x\geq 0$. Conversely, given L, finding the solution of the minimization problem of $\frac{1}{2}RR'$ subject to $R'\in\mathcal{Q}$ and $R-L\in\mathcal{Q}^*$ can be reduced to a linear programming problem.
We made extensive use of quadratic programming software to construct the proof schemes in Tables 1 and 3. Finally, R-package lpSolve[†] is used to handle the cases in Table 1, based on the library of vectors R given in Table 2 at the end of Section 3.

Remark 4.5 *Be given $e_1,\ldots,e_k\in\mathcal{S}$. Suppose $R\in\mathbb{R}^n$ is such that $R'\in\mathcal{Q}$, $e_iR'\geq RR'$ for $i=1,\ldots,k$, and $RR'>1$. Then the following holds: $\min_i|e_iR'|=\min_i e_iR'\geq RR'>\|R\|$.* ■

[†] Michel Berkelaar and others (2015). lpSolve: Interface to 'Lp_solve' v. 5.5 to Solve Linear/Integer Programs. R package version 5.6.13.

We present the following example to Remark 4.4: Consider $e_1 = -\varepsilon_{223} = \varepsilon_{288}$ and $e_2 = \varepsilon_{106}$. Let $a \in \mathcal{Q}$. Suppose that $\varepsilon_{223}a \leq 0$ and $\varepsilon_{106}a \geq 0$. Then we will prove that $\min(-\varepsilon_{223}a, \varepsilon_{106}a) \leq \|a\|$. Take $\lambda = (2,3)/5$ and $R = (3,3,1,1,1,1,1,1,1)/5$, then

$$\begin{aligned} L &= \frac{2}{5}(-\varepsilon_{223}) + \frac{3}{5}\varepsilon_{106} \\ &= \frac{2}{5}(-1,1,1,-1,1,1,1,1,1) + \frac{3}{5}(1,1,-1,-1,1,-1,1,-1,1) \\ &= (1,5,-1,-5,5,-1,5,-1,5)/5, \\ \overline{L} &= (1,6,5,0,5,4,9,8,13)/5, \\ \overline{R} &= (3,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13)/5. \end{aligned}$$

So that it is seen that $\overline{L} \preccurlyeq \overline{R}$. Moreover $\|R\| = 1$ so that

$$\min(-\varepsilon_{223}a, \varepsilon_{106}a) \leq La \leq Ra \leq \|R\|\,\|a\| \leq \|a\|.$$

Obviously, for $e_1^* = -\varepsilon_{222}$ and $e_2^* = \varepsilon_{107}$, given the same λ we have

$$L^* = \frac{2}{5}(-1,1,1,-1,1,1,1,1,-1) + \frac{3}{5}(1,1,-1,-1,1,-1,1,-1,-1) \preccurlyeq L,$$

so that obviously $\overline{L^*} \preccurlyeq \overline{L} \preccurlyeq R$.

References

[1] V.K. Bentkus and D. Dzindzalieta, *A tight Gaussian bound for weighted sums of Rademacher random variables*, Bernoulli **21**(2), 1231-1237 (2015).

[2] Berkovitz, L., *Convexity and optimization in* $\mathbb{R}^n$, Wiley, 2002.

[3] D. Dzindzalieta, *Tight Bernoulli tail probability bounds*, PhD. Thesis, Vilnius, 2014.

[4] D. Dzindzalieta, T. Juškevičius and M. Šileikis, *Optimal probability inequalities for random walks related to problems in extremal combinatorics*, SIAM J. Discrete Math., **26** (2012), no. 2, 828–837.

[5] R.K. Guy, *Any answers anent these analytical enigmas?*, Amer. Math. Monthly **93** (1986), 279–281.

[6] H. Hendriks and M.C.A. van Zuijlen *Sharp upper bounds for the deviations from the mean of the sum of independent Rademacher random variables*, to appear in Annals of Combinatorics (2017).

[7] F. von Heymann, *Ideas for an old analytic enigma about the sphere that fail in intriguing ways* (2012),
`http://boolesrings.org/vonheymann/files/2013/10/Cube_sphere.pdf`

[8] R. Holzman and D.J. Kleitman, *On the product of sign vectors and unit vectors*, Combinatorica **12** (1992), no. 3, 303–316.

[9] K. Oleszkiewicz, *On the Stein property of Rademacher sequences*, Probability and Mathematical Statistics, **16**(1) (1996), 127-130.

[10] I. Pinelis, *An asymptotically Gaussian bound on the Rademacher tails*, Electron. J. Probab. **17**(35) (2012), 1-22.

[11] I. Pinelis, *Toward the best constant factor for the Rademacher-Gaussian tail comparison*, ESAIM Probab. Stat. **11**, 412-426, (2007).

[12] A.V. Zhubr, *On one extremal problem for n-cube*, Tr. Komi Nauchn. Tsentra UrO Ross. AN. **2**(10), 4-11, (2012), (in Russian).

[13] M.C.A. van Zuijlen, *On a conjecture concerning the sum of independent Rademacher random variables*, arXiv:1112.4988v1 [math.PR] (2011).

Harrie Hendriks, Martien van Zuijlen
Radboud University Nijmegen
Faculty of Science, Department of Mathematics
Nijmegen, The Netherlands
{H.Hendriks, M.vanZuijlen}@science.ru.nl